

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification, and claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 11-14 and 17 are amended and new drawing Fig. 7 is added.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication that claim 17 is allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and that claims 9-11 recite allowable subject matter.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Ho in the June 9, 2004 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. Specifically, claims 1, 2, 5, 12 and 17 are amended to comply with the Examiner's helpful suggestions made during the interview.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Formal Matters

A. Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification because of informalities. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments made to the specification obviate these objections. A new paragraph is added to describe a full width exemplary pixel circuitry as shown in new Fig. 7.

B. Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings because the third and fourth capacitors recited in claims 4, 5 and 8-11 are not shown. New Fig. 7 is added to show the features recited in claims 4, 5 and 8-11. New Fig. 7 does not add new matter as it is supported by the specification as originally filed, including at least claims 4, 5 and 8-11.

C. Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 12-14 and 17 because of informalities. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims correct the informalities specified in the Office Action. Therefore, the objections to these claims are obviated.

II. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

A. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action states that it is unclear if the sensor referred to in claims 1, 12 and 17 refers to the two-dimensional array of pixels or some other sensor.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 12 and 17 clearly recite the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the two-dimensional array of pixels and the input device that includes a sensor are clearly recited as distinct features in the imaging system claimed in claims 1, 12 and 17. Thus, the sensor referred to in claims 1, 12 and 17 is a part of the input device which includes a pixel device.

Withdraw of the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

B. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Fossum (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,126). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Fossum fails to disclose or teach all of the features recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 12. Specifically, Fossum fails to disclose or teach the feature of the sensor providing an electronic signal that is controlled by the controller, as recited in claims 1 and 12.

Fossum does not even mention such a feature of a sensor providing an electronic signal. In fact, the electronic signal in 112 in Fig. 1 disclosed in Fossum is the column bus line that does not come from a sensor.

In the alternative, the Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 8, 12, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Chen (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,257). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Chen fails to disclose or teach all of the features recited in claims 1 and 12. Specifically, Chen fails to disclose or teach the feature of the imaging system comprising at least one transistor as recited in claims 1 and 12. In fact, Chen does not even mention a transistor.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections based on Fossum and Chen is respectfully requested.

C. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Fossum and further in view of Cannata (U.S. Patent No. 5,811,808). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Fossum is deficient at least for the reasons stated regarding claim 1 and that Cannata fails to make up for these deficiencies. Cannata is relied upon only to disclose a plurality of capacitors in an offset correction circuit.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4 and 8 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 6, 7 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Fossum in view of Fossum 2 (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,049). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Fossum is deficient at least for the reasons stated regarding claims 1 and 12, and that Fossum 2 fails to make up for these deficiencies. Fossum 2 is relied upon only to disclose a CMOS active pixels sensor for x-ray imaging.

Withdraw of the rejection of claims 6, 7 and 14 is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

Claims 8 and 11 are amended into independent form. Therefore, claims 8-11 are allowable. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

David E. Brown
Registration No. 51,091

JAO:DEB/gew

Attachments:

Amendment Transmittal
New Drawing Sheet (Fig. 7)

Date: June 16, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
--